

## REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-28 are pending in this application. Claim 17 has previously been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 28 has been added. Support for the newly added claim 28 may be found throughout the specification, for example, see FIGS. 1-5.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-16 and 18-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Bowman et al. (U.S. 7,520,867, "Bowman").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-16 and 18-27 as being anticipated by Bowman.

Applicants' claim 1 requires a base having retention devices extending upwardly from an upper surface of the base and that the at least two arms are movable in a laterally inward direction, in a laterally outward direction and in an upward direction away from the base such that movement of the arms in either the laterally inward direction, the laterally outward direction or the upward direction allows disengagement of the arms from the retention devices. Claim 23 also requires that an arm is movable in a laterally inward direction, in a laterally outward direction and in an upward direction away from the base such that movement of the arm in either the laterally inward direction, the laterally outward direction or the upward direction allows disengagement of the arm from the releasable locking member. These features are clearly not taught or suggested by Bowman.

Bowman is directed to a subcutaneous infusion set. (Abstract.) According to Bowman, the connector 16 may be positioned onto the base 26 as follows. The patient may grasp the connector 16 at the depressions 42 and apply a force at those points, thereby flexing the flanges 46 toward a center portion of the connector 16. In so doing the mounting hooks 54 being attached to the flanges 56 will move in a similar direction. The connector 16 may be pushed onto the base 26, thereby disposing the mounting hooks 54 at a position within an area defined by and underneath the mounting groove. (Col. 7, lines 10-15 and 21-23.) In other words,

Bowman discloses flanges 46 that are movable toward a center portion. Bowman clearly fails to teach or suggest that the at least two arms are movable in a laterally inward direction, in a laterally outward direction and in an upward direction away from the base such that movement of the arms in either the laterally inward direction, the laterally outward direction or the upward direction allows disengagement of the arms from the retention devices.

For at least these reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-16 and 18-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) be withdrawn.

In addition, in view of the generality of the Office Action in the rejection of claims 2-16 and 18-27 as being anticipated by Bowman, Applicants respectfully request specific examination on the features of each claim. "In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified." 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2) (emphasis added).

## **II. Summary**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that the application is in condition for allowance. Allowance of the present claims is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above submissions in more detail, the Examiner is asked to please call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 29, 2011

/Heidi A. Dare/

Heidi A. Dare  
Registration No. 50,775  
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, IL 60610  
(312)321-4200